



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Churches at Rome have pagan names—viz., S. Maria Sopra Minerva, S. Maria Aventina, S. Lorenzo in Matuta, and S. Stefano del Cacco.

"There is, moreover, a peculiar cause to which the rapid decline of the pagan doctrines in the west must be ascribed. On the 21st June, 431, two hundred bishops at the Council of Ephesus declared that the Virgin Mary should be honoured as the mother of God. The worship of Mary the mother of God, seems to have been the means which Providence has employed for completing Christianity. The nations were as if dazzled by the image of this Divine mother, who united in her person the two most tender feelings of nature—the pudicity of the virgin, and the love of the mother. They accepted this new worship with an enthusiasm sometimes too great, because with many Christians it became the whole Christianity. The pagans did not even try to defend their altars against the progress of the worship of the mother of God; they opened to Mary the temples which they kept closed to Jesus Christ,* and confessed their defeat. It is true that they often mixed with the worship of Mary those pagan ideas, those vain practices, those ridiculous superstitions, from which they seemed unable to detach themselves; but the Church rejoiced, nevertheless, at their entering into her pale, because she knew that it would be easy to her (?) to purge of its alloy, with the help of time, a worship whose essence was purity itself. Thus, some prudent concessions, temporarily made to the pagan manners, and the worship of Mary, were two elements of force which the Church employed in order to conquer the resistance of the last pagans—a resistance which was feeble enough in Italy, but violent beyond the Alps."

We beg our readers to recollect that the whole of the above long extract is taken from an eminent Roman Catholic writer, and did space permit there is much more of M. Beugnot's work which we might extract with benefit, as proving, in an unanswerable manner, the extent to which pagan rites and ideas were admitted into the Roman Catholic Church by way of compromise between Christianity and paganism; but we shall merely observe, that however natural it is to believe that such a line of policy may have contributed to the rapidity of the extension of the external dominion of Christianity, it as naturally accounts for the introduction into her pale of errors and superstitions, which (as we must ever think the propagation of Divine truth by the Church of Christ to be a matter of principle not policy), we cannot but think, it was her mission to eradicate and destroy, instead of delivering over mankind, as far as lay in her power, to their baneful influence.

With such admissions on the part of an able writer, not at all imbued with Protestant notions or arguments, we think it will not be very difficult to understand or imagine how the saints of the Roman Church, to whom the defence of particular countries was assigned, took the place of the *Dii Tutelares* of the pagan world; how those to whom the safety of certain cities were committed, took the place of their *Dii Præsides*; or such saints as temples and churches were built and altars erected to, of their *Dii Patroni*; in short, how the practice of saint and martyr worship was gradually, during the fourth and fifth centuries, substituted for the hero, or demon worship of pagan Rome.

We have still, however, to show the way in which sincere Christians were themselves gradually led into superstitious practices, which, in the primitive ages, they were ignorant of; and to trace some, at least, of the steps by which this kind of worship grew up to the height which it ultimately arrived at in the Church of Rome.

That during the first ages of Christianity, when persecution raged against it, and martyrdom was no infrequent testimony to the earnestness and devotedness of its professors, the primitive Christians should have held these martyrs and confessors in the greatest honour, on account of the great service they had done to the cause of Christ, was both natural and commendable. In fact, they were in the habit of frequenting their tombs, and rehearsing there the good works they had done in their lifetime, and their faith, patience, and constancy in death. There they blessed God for the grace that was given to them, and proposed their virtues for imitation, and had their own piety and zeal inflamed by the remembrance of them. This was the honour which the primitive Christians deservedly showed to their victorious martyrs—they loved their memories, commemorated their virtues, and blessed God for their example; but they did not invoke them; that, as we showed in our former paper, they reserved as the religious worship which was due to God only.

Towards the middle and latter end, however, of the fourth century, the state of the Church had greatly changed. The Emperor, Constantine the Great, had been converted to Christianity, and the Church had rest and peace, and prosperity began to dawn upon it. Riches

* "Amongst a multitude of proofs," says Beugnot, "I shall choose only one, in order to show what facility the worship of Mary swept away, in its progress, the remnants of paganism which were still covering Europe.—Notwithstanding the preaching of St. Hilary, St. Basil remained faithful to the ancient worship. After the Council of Ephesus, we see eight of the finest pagan temples of that island becoming, in a very short time, churches dedicated to the Virgin. These temples were—(1.) Of Minerva, at Syracuse; (2.) of Venus and Saturn, at Montina; (3.) of Venus Erycina, on the Mount Eryx—believed to have been built by Zoroaster; (4.) of Phæbe, at Agrigento; (5.) of Vulcan, near Mount Etna; (6.) the Pantheon, at Catania; (7.) of Ceres, in the same town; (8.) the Sepulchre of St. Elizabeth."—*Apologie Chronologia Universale di Sicilia*.

and honour at length began to attend the profession, for which so many had suffered martyrdom; and those who were wont to frequent the tombs of the martyrs, that at the sight of the place their affections might be raised, their devotions enlivened, and their faith and charity receive warmth and heat from their burning and shining examples, now that they no longer anticipated a similar fate themselves, soon began to honour the saints more by lofty praises and high sounding commendations, than by endeavouring to become saints themselves by imitating their virtues; and, as is not unusual in religious matters, that they might make up in the one way what they wanted in the other, the language of their panegyrics, and laudatory orations, by degrees broke out into superstitious conceits, and lavish and extravagant expressions, which ended at last in actual invocation or religious worship.

Gregory of Nazianzum, who died about the close of the fourth century, A.D. 396, is referred to by Father Paul (the well-known Roman Catholic commentator on the proceedings of the Council of Trent) as one of those, who, "by addressing the saints in public harangues, laid the foundation of the modern practice of praying to them; though such addresses," he justly adds "ought to be regarded as figures of rhetoric, rather than invocations." Gregory's works, no doubt, contain many panegyrics delivered on the anniversaries, or at the tombs of celebrated Christians, in which, at the close of his collaudation of their virtues, he apostrophizes the martyr, apologizes for his own defects, begging him to accept his exertions, however unworthy of the merits he had been celebrating, and to look favourably on the company who were assembled in his honour. That such apostrophes, however, do not prove that Gregory actually believed that the dead heard or understood his addresses, is plain; for, we find him, by a similar figure of rhetoric, apostrophizing things which never had ears to hear, or a mind to understand. Such as the following*—"Such are thy narrations and wonders, O Egypt," &c.;† and the same thing will appear, perhaps, still more clearly, when we find him addressing dead men and women in the language of uncertainty and doubt (not as to the happiness of true Christians in another world, but as to their power to hear the addresses made to them by any here below). Thus, in his funeral oration upon his own sister Gorgona, he says (Paris Ed., p. 189), "Mayest thou enjoy all these, of which on earth thou receivest a few droppings, from thy genuine disposition towards them. But if thou canst take any interest in our affairs, and this boon be granted by God to pious souls, that they have any perception of such things, receive our address, instead of many, and in preference to many, funeral obsequies, which address we presented to Cæsarius before thee, and now to thee after him.† Better, we know, and far more to be prized, are the things which thou hast now, than what are here seen; the choir of angels, the vision of the Trinity most high, the more pure and perfect illumination of the glory no longer withdrawing itself from a mind in bondage and dissipated by the passions, but certainly contemplated and held by the whole mind, and shining upon our souls with the whole light of the Godhead, and all these thou mayest enjoy," &c. And, again, in his First Invetive against Julian (Id., p. 50), after calling upon all on earth to hear him, the same Gregory adds, "Hear, O Heaven, and give ear O earth . . . and Hear, O thou soul of the great Constantine, if thou hast any perception of these things, and all ye souls of the kings before him who loved Christ."‡ Who could fairly conclude from such passages that Gregory of Nazianzum believed, or intended seriously to teach, that it was proper or justifiable to invoke the saints with religious worship, or to inculcate the belief that they were able to hear or answer our prayers? It is obvious that the language of doubt is not that which St. Gregory would have spoken, had the Church then held it as a matter of faith, that the saints can hear us, and ought to be worshipped.

We might greatly extend quotations illustrative of this subject, but our space forbids us to go further for the present. We think, however, we have already said enough to show our readers in what manner saint-worship was first introduced, and some of the steps, at least, by which, in the fourth and fifth centuries, the minds of Christians became gradually reconciled to practices at variance with the purer worship of the first three centuries.

* By similar apostrophes inanimate things are often addressed in the Holy Scriptures—"Hear, O ye mountains;" "Praise the Lord, ye dragons and all deeps;" and numberless other passages in the poetical books of Scripture.

† Our readers will probably recollect a striking instance of this in our last number, where John Damascenus apostrophizes the tomb of the Virgin, as if it had been a living being.—p. 169.

‡ "Εὖ τίς τις σοὶ καὶ τὸν ἡμετέρον ἐστὶ λόγος, καὶ τοῦτο ταῖς δαΐσιν ψυχαῖς ἐκ Θεοῦ γέρας, τῶν τοιοῦτων ἐπαίθωνται, δίδου καὶ τὸν ἡμετέρον λόγον, οὐτὶ πολλῶν καὶ πρὸ πολλῶν ἐνταρίων, ὃν Καίσαρι μὲν πρὸ σου, καὶ σοὶ μετ' ἐκείνων ἀποδοῦκαμεν."—Greg. Naz. Græc. Lat. Oratio xi. p. 189. Paris, 1630.

§ Ἀκούε καὶ ἡ τοῦ μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου ψυχή, εἰ τις ἀποθνήσκει, δοῦναι πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως μελόχριστον, τοῦ δὲ καὶ πάντων μάλιστα, ὅσῳ τῷ Χριστοῦ εὐχρηνομῶν συναντήσῃς.—Id. p. 50.

HISTORY OF THE POPES.—No. I.

POPE STEPHEN VI., AND POPE FORMOSUS'S FINGERS.

THE office claimed by the Popes is the highest; that has been imagined among men. To be the vicar of Christ, and the successor of Peter, the prince of the Apostles—to decide all questions that can arise in the Church by the authority of Peter, who speaks in the person of the Pope—these are their claims. Thus, when the Irish Roman Catholic bishops were disputing about the national schools, the Pope pronounced his decision, and the Synod of Thurles proclaimed it thus—"Peter has spoken in the person of Pius; the judge has spoken; the controversy is ended." And when Pope Pius shall have decided, for the first time, on the 8th of December next, that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived without sin, the Roman Catholic bishops will equally exclaim, that it is St. Peter who has spoken in the person of Pius.

It is not supposed that Popes have acquired these powers in modern times; no; it is affirmed that the Church has never been without a lawful representative of Peter, speaking by his apostolical authority.

Those who are convinced that this claim is well founded, may well believe that the history of the Popes is worthy of the most attentive study. What a pity that Roman Catholics should be so little acquainted with the lives and actions of the Popes in ages past! May they not, with great reason, expect, that in the history of this divine institution, from age to age, there will be found lessons of justice, wisdom, and truth, superior to any that can be learned in the history of any other institution that ever has existed in the world?

We shall endeavour, from time to time, to open up this mine of hidden wisdom, by giving some of the most striking facts from the lives and history of the Popes. Writing, as we do, for Roman Catholics, we shall, of course, not quote what any Protestant author has written about Popes; we shall confine ourselves entirely to the lives of the Popes, as we find them in the collection of the councils made by the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, and in the annals of Cardinal Baronius, and other authors of the very highest credit in the Church of Rome.

We take as our first instance, the life of Pope Stephen, VI.,* who succeeded Formosus about 896, as we find it in Labbe and Cossart (vol. ix., p. 474, Ed. Par. 1671), who profess to have taken it chiefly from Cardinal Baronius.

"Stephen VI. succeeded Formosus. For Boniface, who invaded the apostolical See, and held it for fifteen days, is not to be reckoned among the Popes. . . . And although each of them obtained the See by force, fear, and tyranny (that is, both Boniface and Stephen VI.), and, therefore, one who was equally an intruder thrust out an intruder, yet Stephen is reckoned in the number and list of the Popes by common consent; because, for the sake of averting the danger of schism, the entire clergy approved of him, although he was a most infamous man, and the whole Catholic Church acknowledged him as vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter."

The account gives some instances as to how he was acknowledged, and then proceeds—"He commenced his pontificate with that sacrilege in which he cast into the Tiber the body of Formosus, dug up out of its grave, clothed with the sacerdotal garments, and mutilated of three of its fingers; and ordered that all who had been ordained by him should be consecrated and ordained over again.†

The life in Labbe and Cossart goes on to express surprise that Onuphrinus, in his notes on Platina, should reject this account as fabulous, since it is proved by ancient documents, and is related by Luitprand,§ in the eighth chapter of the first book of his history; which account the life proceeds to give as follows—" . . . who being appointed, like an impious man and ignorant of the holy doctrines, he ordered that Formosus should be dragged out of his tomb, and placed on the pontifical seat, clothed in the sacerdotal vestments; to whom also he says 'when you were Bishop of Ostia, why did you usurp the universal Roman See, in the spirit of ambition?' These things being done, he ordered him to be cast into the Tiber, stripped of the sacred vestments, and three of his fingers being cut off;

* Some call this Pontiff Stephen the Sixth, others call him Stephen the Seventh: attention to this is necessary, to prevent confusion. The difficulty arises in this way—Roman Catholics do not know whether the Stephen who was first appointed in the year 752 was a Pope or not. It will be seen in this paper that Roman Catholics have no certain way of knowing who were really Popes and who were not. Labbe and Cossart get over this difficulty cleverly: in the list in vol. xvi., p. 122, they count thus—Stephen II., Stephen III., then another Stephen III., and then Stephen IV. Thus they call this man Stephen VI., as the ancient did, and still they contrive to get in all the Stephens—more clever than satisfactory, certainly—in a list of the Popes.

† Stephenus Sextus succedit Formoso. Bonifacius enim qui invadens sedem apostolicam, reuult eam diebus quindecim, non est numerandus inter pontifices. . . . Et quamquam utroque per vim, metum, et tyrannidem, sedem adepti fuerint, adeoque intrusum pariter intrusum expulserit; tamen Stephanus in numero et serie pontificum communis sententia numeratur, quia ad periculum schismatis auerendum, illum quamquam homo ecclesiasticus esset universus clerus approbavit, utroque ecclesia Catholica pro Christi Vicario et successore Petri agnovit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 474. Ed. Paris, 1671.

‡ Pontificatus auspiciis est a sacrilegio illo, quo corpus Formosi exhumatum, sacerdotalibus indumentis indutum, tribusque digitis mutilatum in Tiberem projectum, omnique ab eodem ordinato iterato consecrari et ordinari precepit.

§ This Luitprand was Bishop of Cremona, in Italy. He wrote his history about thirty years after the death of Pope Stephen. He was well acquainted with the facts of those times, and bears the character of a learned and accurate historian.

and he ordained over again, as deposed from their orders, all whom he (Formosus) had ordained.*

That all this really was done by Pope Stephen VI. to the dead body of his predecessor, Pope Formosus, is past all reasonable doubt; for it is not only related by Luitprand who wrote so soon after Stephen's time, but we have another account written by Auxilius, who was himself ordained a priest by Pope Formosus,† who relates exactly the same story, except that he says that Pope Stephen only cut off two fingers of the right hand; in all which, he says, Pope Stephen acted like a wild beast, unmindful of humanity; and he observes that the Lord did not say, whatever you shall bind under the earth or under the river, shall be bound in heaven!—Book ii. ch. 30.

The object of cutting off the dead Pope's fingers is not very clear to us. Why did not the live Pope cut off the dead Pope's head?‡ Why not the toe which all the world had been kissing? Why did he not, at least, cut off all his fingers while he was about it? Was it from moderation? or was there any special reason for it? Some say that these three fingers were used in benediction and ordination; in which case, cutting them off would, of course, disable the dead Pope from ordaining any more; but could scarcely be supposed to affect what he had done while living. But, then, it seems strange that Auxilius, who was himself ordained by Formosus, should speak of only two fingers. If but one had been cut, we might have thought it was done to get off "the fisherman's ring;" and, indeed, the Roman Council under Pope John IX., which condemned the acts of Stephen, expressly says that plunder was the object of the whole proceeding.§

We must return to the account in Labbe and Cossart, who proceed thus with Luitprand's story—"Of how great authority and how religious Pope Formosus was, we can gather from this, since, when he was afterwards found by fishermen and carried to the Church of the blessed Prince of the Apostles, certain images of the saints, with veneration, saluted him, placed in his coffin; for this I have very often heard from most religious men of the city of Rome."||

We should have thought that this miracle would have settled the question, whether the ordinations performed by Pope Formosus were to be considered null, and to be repeated; but we shall see presently that the question continued to rage for seventeen years after, and that different Popes decided it in opposite ways. But to return again to the life of Pope Stephen VI.; it goes on to say—"Pope Stephen added crime to crime, when in a synod which he collected, he approved the nefarious, impious, and detestable act. For the stones themselves, execrating such a monstrosity, then cried out with their own voice by knocking against each other, that they would more willingly suffer spontaneous ruin, than that the Roman Church should remain depressed by so great a scandal. It happened, then, that the sacred Basilica of the Lateran, the principal seat of the Pope, fell prostrate from the altar to the door, an evil angel striking it, because the walls were by no means able to stand, when the first rock of the hinge was shaken by the earthquake of so great a crime."¶

The life in Labbe and Cossart goes on to say, that "the heretics of our time (the Protestants) on account of that impious act, wickedly rise up against the promises of Christ made to Peter and the Church, and boasting too much of victory, triumph too soon."** We give now the defence of these most learned men against the triumph of the Protestants, and let us see if it be satisfactory: "For all things, which Stephen said or did against Formosus, he did as a man struck with madness, fulfilling what his raging fury suggested. But he defined nothing against faith or good morals by pontifical authority lawfully obtained. For the bishops and presbyters who were summoned to a synod about this matter, being not unlike to Stephen, persecuted Formosus with like hatred, and, therefore, pronounced for

that sentence which they knew would be agreeable to a man struck with madness. From whence we acknowledge, indeed, a violent tyranny in fact in this matter; but we confidently deny that an error in faith was defined or approved by Stephen lawfully obtaining pontifical authority; although it would in no way prejudice the apostolic See, if we should grant that an usurper, not lawfully elected, but an intrusive false Pope had erred in affirming articles of faith.**

The force of the defence lies in this—first, that Stephen VI. was a madman, and not lawfully Pope; and, secondly, that he defined nothing against faith or good morals.

As to the first, it is a common and an easy device, when a Pope is convicted of infamous crimes, or sacrilege, or error in faith, to say, "Oh, that man was no lawful Pope; he got the Popedom by tyranny or bribery, or even by worse means, and, of course, the powers of a true and lawful Pope are not to be expected in him." We shall have many instances to show, in which Roman Catholics are driven to set up this defence and excuse for the doings of their Popes.

But is not this the great argument in support of the claims of the Popes—"that it is impossible to believe that God would have left his Church without a visible head, a living and speaking judge, in the place of Christ, whom all might safely follow in the confidence of faith?" And is it not still harder to believe that God should profess and undertake to give his Church such a head and judge, and yet leave the Church liable to be deceived by a false head—to be imposed on by a madman, who was no lawful Pope, and led by him into wholesale sacrilege about the so-called sacrament of orders? If the Church cannot distinguish between a true and a false head, where is her security in having a visible head?

Now, this very account of Pope Stephen in Labbe and Cossart, which sets up this defence, that Stephen was no lawful Pope, does also say (as we have shown above) that "the whole clergy approved of him, and the whole Catholic Church acknowledged him as the Vicar of Christ and the successor of Peter;" and the account concludes by saying, "after he had held the apostolic See six years, being strangled in prison, he closed his life by an infamous death, God being the avenger."† Was not this a great security to the Catholic Church, to be for six years looking up to a sacrilegious madman, who actually filled the place of the Pope, but who was no lawful Pope—mistaking him for the Vicar of Christ and true head of the Church?

This is what Roman Catholics tell us themselves. And then they ask us how we can dare to suppose that God would leave his Church without a visible head, a living and speaking judge in the place of Christ?

And to this we reply, that if God had undertaken to provide such a head, He would not have let it become a delusion and a snare, such as we have it proved by Roman Catholic authority that this Pope Stephen was.

But how do Labbe and Cossart know that this Stephen was not a lawful Pope? The whole Catholic Church thought that he was—nay, Pope John IX., who succeeded soon after, and whom all Roman Catholics acknowledge as a lawful Pope, thought so too; for he held a council at Rome in the year 904, to reverse the proceedings of Pope Stephen and his council against Formosus; and that council of Pope John commences thus—"We wholly repeal the council celebrated in the time of Pope Stephen VI., OF PIUS MEMORY—to wit, OUR PREDECESSOR—in which the venerable body of the venerable Pope Formosus was dragged through the land from its violated sepulchre, . . ."

Clearly, then, the Church at that time, even when it had a Pope whom Roman Catholics now think was a lawful head, did not find out its mistake about Pope Stephen; for the lawful successor, even when repealing Pope Stephen's acts, acknowledged him as a lawful Pope.

To say he was not a lawful Pope is a mere afterthought to get out of a difficulty, and one which Roman Catholics of the present day are not agreed about; for Bishop Milner, in his *End of Controversy* (Letter xxviii., century ix.), thus gives the list of the Popes—" . . . John VIII., Marinus, Adrian III., Stephen VI., Formosus, Stephen VII., Romanus, Theodore II., John IX., Benedict IV., Leo V., Christopher, and Sergius III."

The second point in the defence of Labbe and Cossart against "the heretics," is that Pope Stephen VI. defined nothing contrary to faith or good morals. It is confessed by Labbe and Cossart themselves, that Pope Stephen VI. did commit sacrilege in decreeing that persons who had

been lawfully ordained should be ordained over again; and, we ask, is not sacrilege, at least, contrary to good morals? But was not this sacrilege also contrary to the Roman faith as now held? This is certainly a hard thing to urge against Roman Catholics; because their religion, being formed, from time to time, by additions and inventions of men, is not the same in one age which it becomes in another; and it is hard to expect Popes of the 9th century to decide according to what their religion was to be in the 19th. But while Roman Catholics continue to assert that their religion has been the same in all ages, we must continue to show them the falsehood of this assertion.

It is confessed that Pope Stephen did decree that all who had been ordained by his predecessor, Pope Formosus, should be ordained over again. The Council of Trent declared that three of the sacraments of the Roman Church, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be repeated.* It has ever since been held that it is sacrilege, and contrary to the true Roman faith about the sacraments, to ordain over again those who have once been ordained. But all now acknowledge that those whom Formosus ordained were really ordained; yet Pope Stephen and his council decreed that they should be ordained over again, contrary to the Roman doctrine, as now held about the sacraments. And Auxilius, who was ordained by Formosus, tells us (Book ii. c. 9) that "a great multitude of bishops, priests, and deacons" were so ordained over again. Pope Stephen VI. did, therefore, err in the Roman faith concerning the sacrament of orders; and he led "the whole Catholic Church," who followed him "as the vicar of Christ," into wholesale sacrilege about "the sacrament of orders;" and it was, indeed, a question of faith, that the live Pope and the dead Pope were then cutting off each other's fingers about. And yet we feel that it is rather hard to urge this against Pope Stephen VI., when we consider what has been said about this very case by Father Morinus, the most learned authority of the Church of Rome in the matter of ordination—"It had not yet passed into a thing settled, and AN AXIOM OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH, that whatever ordination performed according to the rites of the Church, and by a bishop ordained according to those rites, was valid, and in no case to be repeated."† So this poor madman, Pope Stephen VI., only erred in not knowing what "the axioms of the Catholic faith" might turn out to be 600 years after! If he was a Pope, he was, at least, no prophet! It is hard to blame him; but we commend this to the consideration of those modern Roman Catholics who still think that "the axioms of the Catholic faith," have been the same in the Church of Rome in all ages. Clearly it was not so about "the sacrament of orders."

One word now about the history of this question about the ordinations of Pope Formosus.

About the year 896, Pope Stephen VI., and his council at Rome, ordered all those ordained by Formosus, to be ordained over again.

In the year 904, Pope John IX., and his council at Rome, repealed all that Pope Stephen and his council had decreed. Benedict IV., Leo V., and Christophorus kept this decree unchanged.‡

About the year 906, Pope Sergius III. renewed the decree that the ordinations of Pope Formosus were to be repeated.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 517.

How long this decree of Pope Sergius III. held good we cannot tell. The following Popes seem too deeply sunk in wickedness to trouble their heads about ordinations. But Morinus says, "this controversy afflicted the Church about seventeen years."—Part iii., cap. 3., p. 69. And that, although Luitprand says, that at the very beginning of the controversy the images of the saints interfered to try and settle it, by bowing down to Pope Formosus in his coffin!

We commend it to Roman Catholics to consider, "where was the head of the Church, and the living and speaking judge in place of Christ, during the pontificate of Pope Stephen VI.?" Even if this were a solitary instance, it is yet enough to disprove the notion that God must always have given such a head to the Church. But we warn them it is not a solitary instance.

We purpose proceeding with the history of the Popes in our next number, and we fear the result will still further horrify those who still try to believe that the Papacy was instituted by God, and that the Pope is the inheritor of the promises made to the Church.

THE SUCCESSION OF ST. PATRICK.

In our number for last August, we published an article "ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE IRISH BISHOPS." At the end of that article we said, "whether Roman Catholics can show a clear succession in the Archbishopric of Armagh, the See of St. Patrick, we will put to the proof in our next number. We will give the succession of the archbishops of Armagh down from Primate Cromer, who was Archbishop of Armagh in 1530, before the Reformation. We now call on all Roman Catholic archbishops in Ireland

* Session vii., canon 9.

† Nondum enim in rem judicatam transierat, et in fidei Catholica axioma, quamlibet ordinationem secundum ecclesie ritum ab episcopo secundum eundem ritum ordinato celebratam, validam esse, et nullo casu iterandam.—Morinus de Sacris ordinationibus, part ii., p. 283. Antwerp, 1695.

‡ Platina says that Pope Romanus, also, abrogated the acts of Stephen; and Pope Theodore II. restored the acts of Formosus.—Ut Supra, p. 114.

* Quo constituto, ut impius, doctrinarumque sanctarum insecus, Formosum a sepulchro extrahit, atque in sede pontificatus sacerdotibus vestimentis indutum collocari precepit, cui ait: "Cum Portuensis esset episcopus, cur ambitionis spiritus Romanam universalem sedem usurpasti?" His expletis, sacris exutum vestimentis, digitiisque tribus abscisis, in Tiberim jactari precepit, cunctosque quos ipse ordinaverat, gradu proprio depositos, iterum ordinavit.

† The two books of Auxilius in defence of the ordinations of Pope Formosus are printed in Morinus de Sac. Ordin., part ii., p. 285. Antwerp, 1695. Few works of that age are written with so much learning and good sense as these of Auxilius.

** If Platina, who was keeper of the Vatican Library, under Pope Sixtus IV., is to be believed, Pope Sergius III., who a second time annulled the acts of Pope Formosus, had his body also a second time exhumed, and actually did cut off his head, and threw his body again into the Tiber!—See Platina De Vitis Pontificum, p. 116, Ed. optima, 1629.

¶ Sub fœdera conspirationis ad capiendum Thesaurum, corpus illius trahentes, &c.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 505. Can. 9. Ed. Paris, 1671.

¶ Quantæ autem auctoritatis, quantæque religionis Papa Formosus fuerit, hinc colligere possumus, quoniam dum a piscatoribus postmodum esset inventus, atque ad beati apostolorum principis ecclesiam deportatus, sanctorum quædam imagines hunc in loco positum venerabiliter salutarunt. Hoc namque a religiosissimis Romanæ urbis viris persæpe auidi.

¶ Addidit culpam culpæ Stephanus Papa, quando collecta synodo, nefarium, impium, et detestandum facinus approbavit. Ipsi enim lapides tale portentum execrati, sua tunc voce mutua collisione clamant, spontaneam libentibus pati ruinam, quam ut Romana ecclesia tanto scandalo depressa maneret. Accidit tunc ut sacrosancta Basilica Lateranensis, primaria pontificis sedes, impulso angelo malo, ab altari usque ad portas prostrata corruerit, quia nequaquam stare poterant parietes, dum prima cardinis petra tanti facinus terræ motu concussa fuisset.

¶ Hæretici nostri temporis . . . contra promissiones Christi Petro et ecclesie factas, propter illud factum impium male insurgunt et præmature nimis de victoria gloriantur triumphum agunt.

* Omnia enim quæ Stephanus contra Formosum dixit vel egit, homo furor percitus egit, implens id quod exæstantis rabies ausuit. Pontificia vero auctoritas legitime usurpata nihil contra adrem vel bonos mores definitivum. Nam qui hac de causa ad synodum convocati sunt episcopi et presbyteri Stephanano non dissimiles, simili odio Formosum præsquebantur, adeoque in eandem sententiam pronuntiabant, quam homini furor percitus gratam fore præseebant. Unde hac in re violentam quidem tyrannidem in facto accusamus, errorem autem in fide per Stephanum pontificem auctoritatem legitime usurpantem definitivum vel approbatum fuisse constanter pernegamus; quamquam nihil sedi apostolicæ præjudicaretur, si dæremus invasorem non legitime electum, sed intrusum pseudopontificem in articulis fidei asserendis aberrasse.

† Postquam sedem apostolicam sex annis tenuisset, in eodem carcere strangulatus, Deo vindice, exitu infami vitam clausit.

‡ Synodum tempore piæ recordationis sexti Stephani papæ, decessoris videlicet nostri celebratam, in quam venerabile corpus Formosi venerandi papæ, de sepultura violata per terram tractum est, . . . penitus abdicamus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 502.

§ This is the same Stephen, called Stephen VI. by Labbe and Cossart, as observed in a foregoing note; another proof, as we there remarked, that the Roman Church has no certain means of saying of any particular Pope, whether he be a true head of the Church or not.